



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,363	03/25/2004	Yasuki Tamura	1472-0322P	4748
2292	7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ESHETE, ZELALEM	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3748		
DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/808,363	TAMURA ET AL.
	Examiner Zelalem Eshete	Art Unit 3748

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 4-8 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the RCE filed on 06/29/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bale et al. (6,687,601).

Regarding claim 1: Bale discloses a failure diagnostic system for an exhaust pressure increasing device, comprising: an intake channel and an exhaust channel in communication with a cylinder of an internal combustion engine (see figure 1); an exhaust pressure increasing device that increases an exhaust system pressure of said exhaust channel (see numeral 66); an intake system pressure detecting device provided in said intake channel, for detecting an intake system pressure (see numeral 102); an intake valve that selectively allows and prohibits communication between the intake channel and the cylinder (see figure 1) and an exhaust pressure increase failure diagnostic means for determining as to whether the exhaust pressure increasing device

has failed according to the detected intake pressure obtained by said intake system pressure detecting device or intake pressure obtained at a time within a predetermined period of time since the intake valve has allowed the intake channel to communicate with the cylinder and a predetermined failure diagnosis reference range (see figure 2; Table 1; column 10, lines 55 to 67).

Regarding claim 2: Bale discloses the exhaust pressure increase failure diagnostic means compares the detected intake system pressure and, the predetermined failure diagnosis reference range, and determines that the exhaust pressure increasing device has failed when a maximum value of the detected intake system pressure lies outside the predetermined failure diagnosis reference range (see figure 2; column 8, line 62 to column 9, line 10).

Regarding claim 3: Bale discloses a failure notifying device that notifies a failure, the failure notifying device notifying a failure when said exhaust pressure increase failure diagnostic section determines that the exhaust pressure increasing device has failed (see figure 2, numeral 166).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bale.

Bale discloses the claimed invention as recited above; however, fails to specifically disclose "only within predetermined period of time".

However, Bale discloses a time within a predetermined period of time since the intake valve has allowed the intake channel to communicate with the cylinder and a predetermined failure diagnosis reference range (see figure 2; Table 1; column 10, lines 55 to 67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the claimed invention since Bale's device is capable of being programmed to obtain the data "only within predetermined period of time" (see figure 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4-8 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 06/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument on page 8: Bale discloses an intake air pressure sensor that is capable of detecting the intake air pressure at all time, including a time within a predetermined period of time since the intake valve has allowed the intake channel to communicate with the cylinder (see figure 1). In addition, as applicant admits, the intake air pressure can be used as the air handling system operating parameter when diagnosing operation of the exhaust throttle (see page 15, second paragraph). Moreover, Bale's device is capable of being programmed to obtain the data "only within predetermined period of time" (see figure 1).

7. While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959).

8. Regarding the means plus function language of claim 1: With respect to the third prong of this analysis, see *Seal-Flex*, 172 F.3d at 849, 50 USPQ2d at 1234 (Radar, J., concurring) ("Even when a claim element uses language that generally falls under the step-plus-function format, however, 112 ¶ 6 still does not apply when the claim limitation

itself recites sufficient acts for performing the specified function."); Envirco Corp. v. Clestra Cleanroom, Inc., 209 F.3d 1360, 54 USPQ2d 1449 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (holding "second baffle means" does not invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, because the word "baffle" itself imparts structure and the claim further recites the structure of the baffle); Rodime PLC v. Seagate Technology, Inc., 174 F.3d 1294, 1303–04, 50 USPQ2d 1429, 1435–36 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (holding "positioning means for moving" does not invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, because the claim further provides a list of the structure underlying the means and the detailed recitation of the structure for performing the moving function removes this element from the purview of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph); Cole v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 102 F.3d 524, 531, 41 USPQ2d 1001, 1006 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (holding "perforation means...for tearing" does not invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, because the claim describes the structure supporting the tearing function (i.e., perforation)). In other cases, the Federal Circuit has held otherwise. See Unidynamics Corp. v. Automatic Prod. Int'l, 157 F.3d 1311, 1319, 48 USPQ2d 1099, 1104 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (holding "spring means" does invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph). During examination, however, applicants have the opportunity and the obligation to define their inventions precisely, including whether a claim limitation invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Thus, if the phrase "means for" or "step for" is modified by sufficient structure, material or acts for achieving the specified function, the USPTO will not apply 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, until such modifying language is deleted from the claim limitation. In the instant application the examiner

deems the means plus function language of claim 1 is modified by sufficient structure that the USPTO will not apply 112 6th paragraph.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zelalem Eshete whose telephone number is (571) 272-4860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Denion can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zelalem Eshete
Examiner
Art Unit 3748



Thomas Denion
THOMAS DENION
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700